UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/574,858	04/06/2006	Akira Nakano	L8638.06106	5528	
<sup>52989</sup> Dickinson Wrig	7590 06/22/200 ght PLLC	9	EXAMINER		
James E. Ledbe	etter, Esq.	GARCIA, FRANCIS Y			
International Square 1875 Eye Street, N.W., Suite 1200			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Washington, DC 20006			3746		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/22/2009	PAPER	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Comments	10/574,858	NAKANO ET AL.	NAKANO ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	FRANCIS GARCIA	3746					
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence add	dress				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILIN:  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory provided period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by some Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the reamed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC, FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a repn. eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT statute, cause the application to become ABA	ATION.  Oly be timely filed  HS from the mailing date of this control (NDONED) (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	02 March 2009						
·— · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	This action is non-final.						
		rs prosecution as to the	merits is				
,—	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
•	ioi Ex parto Quayro, 1000 C.D.	11, 100 0.0. 210.					
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are pending in the applica	ition.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.	6)☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exar	miner.						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>06 April 2006</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
	c Examinor. Note the attached	Since Action of formal a	0 102.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority document of the copies of the priority document of the copies of the priority document of the copies of the copies of the application from the International But * See the attached detailed Office action for a copies of the attached detailed Office action for a copies of the attached detailed Office action for a copies of the attached detailed Office action for a copies of the attached detailed Office action for a copies of the copies of the attached detailed Office action for a copies of the copies of the priority document of the copies of the priority document of the priority documen</li></ul>	ments have been received. ments have been received in Ap priority documents have been r ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	plication No eceived in this National	Stage				
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	B) Paper No(s)	mmary (PTO-413) /Mail Date ormal Patent Application -·					

Application/Control Number: 10/574,858 Page 2

Art Unit: 3746

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1-19 are drawn to a hermetic compressor and its suction muffler, classified in class 417, subclass 312.
- II. Claims 20 and 21 are drawn to a method of making a suction muffler, classified in class 264, subclass 45.4.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

- 2. Inventions II and I are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the suction muffler can be made with other types of molding, such as sand molding.
- 3. Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:
  - (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
  - (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;

Application/Control Number: 10/574,858 Page 3

Art Unit: 3746

(c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);

- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C.101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

- 4. A telephone call was made to James Ledbetter on 6/17/2009 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.
- 5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).
- 6. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

  Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

  All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process

Application/Control Number: 10/574,858

Art Unit: 3746

claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Page 5

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to FRANCIS GARCIA whose telephone number is (571)270-7105. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 9-5 p.m. EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Devon Kramer can be reached on (571)272-7118. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/574,858 Page 6

Art Unit: 3746

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Devon C Kramer/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3746

/FRANCIS GARCIA/ Examiner, Art Unit 3746